

REMARKS

Claims 1-64 were pending in the application. By this paper, claims 1-64 remain pending and have not been amended.

Species Election Requirement

The official action sets forth a species election requirement and identifies a rather large number of species, some by reference to claims and some by reference to drawing figures. The action notes the following alleged species: Species I drawn to claims 1-7; Species II drawn to claims 8-13; Species III drawn to claims 14, 15, 17, and 38-44; Species IV drawn to claims 16, 18, 23-30, 45-50, and 57-64; and, Species V drawn to claims 19-22 and 51-55. The action further states that Figs. 4 and 6 are each drawn to a different species of printhead and that Figs. 8, 9A, 9B, 10A, 10B, and 11 are each drawn to one of six different species of fluid supply systems.

Notably, claims 31-37 and 56 are not identified as being drawn to any particular species. First, the action states that claims 31-34 are believed to be generic. The applicants disagree. Instead, claims 31-34 are believed to only be generic to and read on the identified Species III-V. Species I and II do not identify reservoir positions and claims 31-34 make no reference to manifolds or pressure characteristics relating to manifolds.

Also, claims 35-37 are drawn to Species I identified in the action. Claim 56 reads on the identified Species IV.

In accordance with the remarks set forth below, the applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the original species election requirement and further requests substitution of a proposed alternative restriction/species election requirement as set forth herein.

Provisional Election

In order to comply with the requirements of the action, the applicants provisionally elect Species I *with traverse*. Claims 1-7 and 35-37 read on the identified Species I, which is said to be shown in Figure 6 of the application. However, the applicants traverse the species election requirement as being unclear. A proposed alternative restriction/species election requirement proposed herein.

Proposed Alternative Restriction/Election Requirement

As an alternative to the species requirement set forth in the action, the applicants propose an alternative restriction/species election requirement. The applicants first believe restriction would be proper between a proposed claim Group I including claims 1-13 and 35-37, and a proposed claim Group II including claims 14-34 and 38-64. Claims 1-13 and 35-37 of proposed Group I are directed to a droplet deposition apparatus with a fluid inlet manifold having specific pressure characteristics as a result of manifold properties. Claims 14-34 and 38-64 of proposed Group II are directed to a droplet deposition apparatus with various fluid reservoir arrangements and fluid delivery characteristics.

Within proposed claim Group I, the applicants also believe election of species might be proper between a proposed Species I directed to the arrangement of Fig. 4 and a proposed Species II directed to the arrangement of Fig 6. The applicants also note that proposed claim Group II may be said to include a number of species. Within proposed Group II, these are a proposed Species III directed to Fig. 8, a proposed Species IV directed to Fig. 9A, a proposed Species V directed to Fig. 9B, a proposed Species VI directed to Figs. 10A and 10B together, and a proposed Species VII directed to Fig. 11.

Figs. 10A and 10B fall within a single species as they include essentially the same fluid delivery system. Fig. 10B illustrates an alternative position for an identical element within Fig. 10A, i.e., diverter valve 5000.

Election Under Proposed Alternative Restriction/Election Requirement

If the examiner withdraws the original species election requirement and accepts the proposed alternative restriction/species election requirement, the applicants provisionally elect, *without traverse*, the claims of proposed Group I, including claims 1-13 and 35-37. The applicants then further elect to prosecute the proposed Species II directed to Fig. 6 within proposed Group I. However, claims 1-13 and 35-37 of proposed Group I are believed to read on both Fig. 4 and Fig. 6.

CONCLUSION

The applicants have made, as required, a provisional election, with traverse, based on the original species election requirement set forth in the action. However, the applicants have proposed a modified alternative restriction/species election requirement set forth above. If

the examiner accepts the alternative proposal, the applicants have provided a provisional election, without traverse, from that alternative proposal.

Should the examiner have any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Reconsideration and alteration of the election requirement is respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing remarks.

A petition for a four-month extension of time and the appropriate fee accompany this paper. No additional fee is believed due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of the undersigned's firm.

Respectfully submitted,



Bryan J. Lempia
Reg. No. 39,746
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Dr.
6300 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 474-6300

January 23, 2004

RECEIVED
FEB -4 2004

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

